Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0328TN-1 for Clarksville Montgomery County School System

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	**10**	**8**

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The reform vision is complete and well documented. It addresses three of the Race core assurance areas. It does not sufficiently address the development of school leaders. Most of the proposed reforms are comprehensive and coherent. These are: HS Redesign, Tier Interventions, Teacher selection/development and Parent engagement/involvement. The past and current district strategic plans (Appendix) are additional sound evidence that support their Race plan vision because they clearly state that the strategic work of the LEA is: improving student achievement, maximizing employee capacity and engaging the public in the support of student achievement. The strategic plans support that the LEA vision is intended to accelerate student learning and provide personalized student support.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	**10**	**6**

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The implementation approach (four strategies/components) is generally well documented, thorough and convincing. Three (HS Redesign, Tier Interventions and Teacher Development) of the strategies are particularly sound and extensive. The Parent Engagement/Involvement strategy is inadequate and vague because it does not consist of comprehensive components and has insufficient proposed resources (budget). The process and criteria for school selection is not described (A.2.a). It appears that the applicant proposes that all their schools will participate. They do provide data that complies with Criterion A.2.c (i.e., participating numbers of students and students).

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	**10**	**5**

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal does not specifically address this criterion in the narrative. A high quality plan is not articulated. No clear discussion or plan for scaling up their Race reforms is presented in the main narrative or the appendix. Thus, there is little discussion or description of how their reforms would be scaled up district-wide. Elsewhere in the proposal, they do, briefly, describe possible actions that could contribute to scaling up their reform proposals, such as: annually the district increases in student enrollment so that additional infrastructure (personnel and capital needs) will be available; the foundation and the community support various reforms; and additional funding opportunities can be pursued.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	**10**	**7**

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Detailed high quality and coherent data tables are presented for their four sub-areas: summative assessments, decreasing achievement gaps, graduation rates and college enrollment. For academic achievement, the state goal is 2% improvement annually. The applicant proposes 3%. For closing achievement gaps, the applicant also proposes 3% annually which appears to be the same as the state requirement (A.4.b). It is puzzling why three student gap populations (Black, Hispanic and Native American) are combined and reported as single group labeled as "BHN" in the closing the gap table, but Black and Hispanic are disaggregated in the Graduation Rate table (and Native Americans are not even reported in the Graduation table (A.4.c). The goal to achieve 100% graduation rates for all sub groups is ambitious and achievable

because they provide they are currently at 95% and demonstrated significant improvement during the past 4+ years. The improvement goal for college enrollment is modest at about 2% annually. Most of the improvement goals are modestly ambitious and achievable.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	**15**	**8**

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The prior track record of success during the past 4 years is partially documented. Some items in the track record are confusing. They refer to an unnamed appendix several times. There are nearly 30 appendices and it is difficult to know which one is the relevant one. Math and reading annual measurable objectives are provided for only 3 years (the criterion asks for four years). Math and reading show improvements. Writing achievement is above average, but past growth was generally flat (source: CMCSS KPI's, Appendix). Writing does not show consistent success over the past four years. Graduation rates do document consistent and significant steady success. Data for college enrollment during the past 4 years were not located. There have been solid improvements in the ACT and AP data. Student performance data is available (criterion B.1.c). They do not provide evidence that their persistently lowest achieving schools or low-performing schools have achieved ambitious and significant reforms during the past four years. Therefore, the criterion is incomplete and met to a medium level.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	**5**	**1**

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant cites a high level of transparency in the four expenditure categories identified in the criterion: salaries for instructional and support staff, teachers and non-personnel costs. These are provided in district wide budgets and not school-level for each school. No examples of school-level expenditures for salaries for instructional and support staff, teachers and non-personnel were found in the proposal.

	Available	Score
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	**10**	**10**

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates evidence that they have sufficient autonomy under Tennessee state legal, statutory and regulatory requirements to implement their proposal. Each local school board has significant authority to manage and control public schools in their jurisdiction. The following evidence demonstrates that the LEA has used this autonomy to consistently focus on improving student learning by significantly improving graduation rates, increasing achievement and implementing high quality strategic work plans.

	Available	Score
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	**10**	**3**

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The extent of stakeholder engagement and support is undocumented. They describe how stakeholders are involved with the district Strategic Plan and several other positive initiatives (i.e., increasing graduation rate, etc.). However, this criterion is about meaningful and significant engagement in the development of this grant proposal and stakeholder support thereof. No evidence was found that at least 70% of participating teachers support the proposal (B.4.ii). Second, there are very few letters of support from other stakeholders (only a couple of mayors had letters), criterion B.4.b. These findings lead to the finding that this criterion is barely met.

	Available	Score
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	**5**	**4**

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes the and past current activities and plans in implementing personalized learning and the rationale behind their reform strategies, including gaps and needs that have been and will continue to be addressed. The district budget (not project budget) includes a detailed list of unfunded needs in instruction, technology and operations. The Strategic work plan also describes several key performance indicators that further document gaps and needs (Appendix). The plans are high quality because they show significant successes in their graduation rates, student achievement and personalization.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	**20**	**10**

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A lengthy (20+ pages) and thorough four year Learning plan is provided for implementing their Race proposal. It is organized by major activities, key implementation steps, associated budget and performance metrics.

The strengths are: the district strategic work plan is organized around improving student learning and seems to be the foundation of the Race grant plan; the four project goals are clearly described; direct instruction and virtual instruction are included; a three tier intervention pyramid is well described and intended to especially serve high need students (C.b.v); quality digital learning will be a key component; high school academies will be implemented and enhanced;

The weaknesses are: there is no evidence that district parents and educators support the plan (criteria C.1.a and C.1.b.); there is no description of whether or how there will be access and exposure to diverse culture and perspectives; the strategies for engaging the public and parents are insufficient (this is further cited in their own accreditation report which describes one of their required actions as better inform external stakeholders about specific education activities, page 159); several of the Learning plan components are incomplete because they say "still in development"; and the discussion of value added growth data is confusing because they do not provide a clear, succinct description of this methodology (page 40-41) .

	Available	Score
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	**20**	**15**

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A high quality plan (as defined in the Grant criteria) is not fully documented. They have some of the components of such a plan. They describe how most participating educators will engage in quality training, professional teams or communities that will enhance their skills to implement the proposed reform plan. Teachers and classified staff will engage in quality training and professional communities; a new state evaluation system provides a more comprehensive view of each teacher and principal's strengths and weaknesses and provides a personalized and individualized approach to coaching and professional development (Criteria C.2.a.iv); student progress is frequently and clearly measured (by their system of key performance indicators) and the results will be used to improve educator practice; a new Individual Learning Path (for both Certified, administrators and Classified staff) will be carried out so that data from the teacher/administration evaluation system will be directed to professional development activities aligned with their personal needs. Weakness: It is unclear whether and what type of training school leadership teams will have to enhance their skills and duties (criterion C.2.c). Therefore, the applicant does have components of a high quality plan with some/few weaknesses.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	**15**	**12**

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The plan includes a description of the applicant policies, practices and rules. The organization of the central office is well outlined, detailed and should provide effective assistance to the pilot schools. Each school has a variety of teams and support structures that guide their work within the building such as Leadership Team, Data Team, School Improvement Team, and Professional Learning Communities. There is little, detailed description about school leadership teams, their authority and decision-making, and whether they have any kind of autonomy or flexibility about such factors as school schedules, calendars, staffing, budgets or other substantive policies (criterion D.1.b). Students do have several opportunities to earn credit on demonstrated mastery (crit. D.1.c). There is little information about what kind of learning resources and instructional practices are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners (crit. D.1.e). A Continuous Improvement Policy Manual and Board Policies are included in the Appendix. They include little or no discussion about school leadership teams or decentralized, school-based decision making. Overall, the evidence is strong with slight weaknesses.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There is substantial evidence that participating students, parents, educators have appropriate access to content, tools and resources to support the proposal. Several IT systems are available, such as: management systems with connections from student to teachers, to buildings, to the district, to the state, and to national data; TestDrive (a local assessment and data management system to administer, score and analyze benchmark and achievement information); PowerSchools, a student information system which includes student course, grades, and assessment data aligned with teacher information; PLAN a professional development data system; and MUNIS an integrated financial system that manages financials, human capital management, services and revenues (criteria D.2.c and d). No infrastructure weaknesses were identified.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	9

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The primary continuous Improvement process related to the Race plan is based on the district 2002 Strategic Planning Process. This includes: mid and end of year reviews; monthly stakeholder meetings; monthly principal reviews; weekly meetings by other groups (senior leadership team, consulting teachers, school faculties, etc.); district accreditation process; and ISO Certification process. It is unclear who, whether and how the grantee will publicly share information on their Race to the Top grant. Overall, the strategies to provide timely and regular feedback about Race grant progress and investments are not clearly described.

	Available	Score
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

It is unclear who (and how) will be primarily responsible for ongoing communication and engagement about the plan implementation so that the plan will continuously be improved, as needed. The applicant cites various, current communication and engagement structures for all traditional programs, but this criterion is about ensuring that Race grant information needs a high quality and focused level.

	Available	Score
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

A detailed table includes twelve proposed performance measures (overall and by subgroup with annual targets). The baseline year is not identified in the table. Most of these are related to the four planned major activities.   Measure # 11 is about child obesity. No rationale is provided as to how or whether this relates to student learning or any other student outcome. There is no discussion about how the project will review and improve the measures over time (criterion E.3.c).

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant combines their response to E-1, continuous improvement, and E-4, evaluating effectiveness of investments criterion. They, again, cite a variety of existing and on-going meetings and reviews by existing groups and departments. They do not clearly and specifically describe their plan to evaluate each of their four major reforms: professional development, HS reform model, three tiered intervention and the parent involvement component.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	**10**	**5**

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

An overall budget summary is presented. It includes total costs for each of the four project years and a breakdown of costs for each of the major components. Most cost items appear to be reasonable.

Weaknesses: a rationale was not found; no indication whether the grant funds will include any other funds, such as state or foundation or stakeholders (they say the foundation does provide financial assistance to the district annually, but there is no specific amount identified to supplement this grant); one of the four major reforms is parent engagement, but only about $60,000 per year is budgeted (this is inadequate to sufficiently meet this priority); as to long-term sustainability (criterion F.1.c.ii), they say a significant portion of the grant work would not have to be sustained as a result of capacity building of staff (page 93). However, they do not describe how capacity building will be ensured.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	**10**	**3**

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

As to long-term sustainability, they say a significant portion of the grant work would not have to be sustained as a result of capacity building of staff (page 93) and it will continue as the district grows and the basic (non-grant) budget increases. They do not describe how capacity building will be ensured. They do not have a high quality plan for sustainability. No budget for the three years after the grant was located.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	**10**	**3**

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

They do not provide a coherent description of a partnership designed to provide additional student and family supports related to social, emotional or behavioral needs, particularly high need students. They provide a list of 12 diverse partners, but there is no evidence or their commitment and support for this priority. In addition, there is no evidence that the partnership is coherent and sustainable. They identify 12 population-level results (they call these performance measures), but these are the same 12 performance measures already included in the core Race plan. They do not describe how this partnership will integrate education and other services with participating schools (criterion 4). There is no description of the partnership decision making process and infrastructure.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

See related detailed strengths documented in the score criteria, particularly in sections A, B and C.

Total	**210**	**124**

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	5

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The supplement primarily consists of purchasing additional laptops for about 1,800 grade 12 students and 200 middle school teachers. They project activities described are those already included in the main Race proposal (NTM and the reading and math 3-tier interventions). Therefore, this does not appear to be a distinctly separate project nor does it appear to be particularly innovative. The plan is not considered high quality. There is no indication that the supplemental plan will carry out activities that would be co-developed and implemented across two or more LEAs.

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0328TN-2 for Clarksville Montgomery County School System

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	**10**	**9**

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

CMCSS displays structural evidence of a developing reformation instructional process that addressed core educational assurance areas.

- CMCSS utilizes the Strategic Planning Process, which incorporates elements of data systems, standards and assessments in gauging effectiveness of student learning.
- CMCSS articulates a plan to engage in personalized student support and career readiness.

CMCSS New Tech High School program carves out an opportunity for "at risks" student segment to develop personal involvement in their educational growth and receive individualized support for academic and career development.

- The New Tech High School utilizes the High School design concept of a school within a school.

- The New Tech High School provides individual student academic interest while building college and career readiness.

This applicant displays a broad base of articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision. The vision includes stakeholders, utilization of data analysis and progress monitoring with monthly and annual assessments. It also includes processes and opportunities that could lead to accelerated learning, student achievement and outcomes.

The implementation of the New Tech High School is comprehensive, but the applicant did not reference the choice of the students' academic interest, only a response to increase student learning with the planned system, therefore one point was not included.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The full evidence of supporting data was only partially completed by the applicant in this criteria.

- No criteria indicated that would show a process for school identification.
- Lists of schools were provided, however no selected process was evident, even though named schools were provided.

A list of schools that will participate in the grant activities was clearly documented. The document has a chart identifying participating schools, which includes elementary, middle, and high schools, along with Middle College (APSU) that includes 11th and 12th graders.

- Participating schools included low-income and high need students.
- Participating schools listed the number of participating educators.

While some strong evidence was provided, several key areas were lacking, resulting in a medium/low score.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant uses their Strategic Planning Process that aligns the mission and vision, as well as objectives, data analysis with formulation and implementation, progress monitoring with monthly and annual evaluations.
- Critical to reducing student achievement subgroup gaps, the four project components are clearly listed: implementation of the New Tech High school, the expansion of the Districts' 3-Tier Intervention Pyramid, central to work - recruitment, retention, and professional development, and parent engagement and involvement.
- Some elements of a high-quality plan are found throughout the document to support (A)(3), with significant searching the document.
- Therefore, the applicant is awarded three points for this criterion.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

CMCSS includes a comprehensive summative assessment being used.

CMCSS's academic achievement goals are detailed, clear, and as written lends itself to successful implementation.

- CMCSS's improvement gains include a goal of 3% improvement of proficient/advanced for each subgroup for each academic year, which is 1% higher than the states.
- CMCSS sets a high normal curve equivalence of 55, which is higher than the majority of other states.

The chart displayed numerical support without a clear-cut plan to decrease achievement gaps.

- CMCSS does not provide a robust feasible statement to accompany the chart provided.
- The narrative is lacking in plausibility and is unclear.

Graduation Rates

CMCSS seeks to achieve 100% graduation rate.

- Given the current small cohort of potential graduates and low drop out rate, CMCSS has a reasonable chance of success.
- However, no narrative was provided outlining a plan of action.

College enrollment rates
Applicant apparently relinquishes successful competition to strong college alternative as listed in the document. However, CMCSS's plans on increasing college attendance percentage that is not a traditional draw to the military.

- The third largest military population is in close proximity of the high schools.
- Each high school has a highly developed ROTC program.
- College recruitment has strong competition, due to military tradition.

Applicant nearly fully complies with most portions of this criterion, but omits key support in some areas as noted, therefore the applicant receives a medium/high score.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	**15**	**11**

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

CMCSS delivered a robust array of documentation supporting demonstrated evidence of prior successes and conditions of reform in most areas.

- CMCSS has maintained a high level of organizational management effectiveness as evidenced by ISO 9001 and AdvancED.
- Math and Reading measured at key transition grade levels show continued gains over the last three years.
- (four years of data desired)
- Black students consistently perform poorly and lag behind in academic achievement gains.
- Unclear or insufficient supporting documentation to demonstrate increasing equity in learning and teaching. However, the advances in academic gains could serve as evidence of effective pedagogical interventions.
- Although inferred through data depicting increases in learning gains displayed by economically disadvantage students, low-performing schools were not specified as required.
- Additionally, applicant names Public Engagement through Web Communications as one its key performance indicators (KPI), and charts a 25% increase in unique visitors to its Focus WebTV. Applicant does not detail the content of information accessed, however.

Closely fulfills requirement for this criteria, with some omissions, resulting in a medium to high score.

| **(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)** | **5** | **3** |

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CMCSS offers public access to the source and use of public and private monies expended in public education.

- Applicant narrows the interpretation and scope of this criteria by limiting their information to the mention of a website containing district finances and budget related data.
- Applicant did not include the information of the finances and budget at the school level.
- Detailed descriptions of budgets are contained in seven categories which encompass the totality of monies spent in carrying out public education.
- Through their website and community meetings, CMCSS offers comprehensive descriptions of instructional and student support for public consumption.
- Applicant reveals an increase in visitors to its website and increases by nearly 500 visits monthly.

The applicants' districts budget is presented at the rear of the document and complies with the criteria requirements and results in a medium compliance score.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provides evidence of statutory code and legal authority permitting CMCSS to engage in the proposed personalized learning environments.

- CMCSS names and specifies the authorizing governance of public schools within its jurisdiction.
- The Director of Schools wields broad powers, but is frequently assessed for performance improvement with detailed expectations from both the CMCSS Board of Education, the Chief Executive Officer, also called the Director of Schools.
- School Board affords the director broad latitude to implement teacher development and ability to explore and implement tools to enhance student learning gains.
- Additionally, the board is not constrained by complex regulatory agencies that could serve to encumber decision making.

These above criterion should permit the applicant to support ideals of this grant, resulting in the applicant receiving a strong score.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

CMCSS offered limited concrete evidence that would demonstrate a description of how participants and end-users shared their input into the proposal.

- Various business, civic and religious groups were identified as CMCSS partners, but insufficient to fully support the engagement process utilized to solicit input that would affect the proposal.

While the applicant identifies several community partners, missing, is evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement from these apparently strong partners. As such, the applicant receives a medium score.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

- CMCSS outlines ambitious, extensive interventions to address and close student learning gaps as revealed through standardized tests and early identification processes.

- CMCSS proposes adoption of several proven models of success, including a form of 9th grade transition program (New Tech High School); early identification of Reading and Mathematics learning issues; teacher retention and recruitment; emphasis on learning gap reduction among historically low performing sub-groups.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	**20**	**15**

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- CMCSS presents a comprehensive, ambitious plan to incorporate programs and processes designed to address a broad scope of student learning styles and develop teachers to implement them.
- CMCSS's proposal does not readily address advantages of multicultural exposure and development of critical thinking skills. Much can be learned from the culture of others.
- Programs identified in CMCSS's proposal aim to further develop existing programs and implement newer ones, which support personalized learning development.
- The comprehensive presentation of programs, documented history of related performance and ambitious outlined plans presented by the applicant warranted a high score.

	Available	Score
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	**20**	**15**

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- CMCSS demonstrates strong methodology to identify, develop, assess and retain effective teachers.
- CMCSS has identified programs to facilitate personalized professional development strategies that seek to empower teachers to enhance individualized student learning achievements.
- CMCSS has implement well-researched programs and development plans to increase teacher efficiency, satisfaction and deliveries.
- Applicant demonstrates strong record of teacher and administrator development with Policy Governance and Professional Development Activities Network. These two professional development programs are further supported by a myriad of other programs to ensure personalization of these development activities.
- Student are presented with learning/career tracks designed to enhance their potential for academic development and preparation for college and/or career readiness.
- College Readiness Benchmarks track state mandated assessments in English, Math, Science, Reading and Composite.

Robust presentation of programs, documented history of related performance and future outlined plans presented by applicant warranted a high score.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	**15**	**11**

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

CMCSS choose to combine D1 and D2. These two criteria points pertains to practices, policies, rules and school infrastructure. Each subset of criteria requirements (a through e) is adequately fulfilled through numerous programs, policies and practices within the CMCSS's district's governing structure.

- Director of Schools wields broad powers to effect change processes that will positively affect personalized learning efforts.
- The overarching guidance tool is their Strategic Planning concept, from which individual schools and teachers develop their Action Plans of implementation.
- Collection, interpretation and communication of aggregate data is conveyed to a wide range of stakeholders.
- This information is used in personalized student and teacher development plans.

Applicant provides acceptable evidence of being able to support each element. Separation of these two criteria may have supported a high score. Lack of separation and detail per each criteria resulted in less than perfect score.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	**10**	**10**

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

D1 & D2

- The applicant chose to combine these two criteria points pertaining to practices, policies, rules and school infrastructure.
- Each subset of criteria requirements (a through d) is adequately fulfilled through numerous programs, policies and practices within the district's governing structure.
- Applicant uses numerous tools to assess students, tools to interpret data including TestDrive, PowerSchools, EVASS, EdTools and more. These data management and information tools enhance LEA's ability to support grant application.
- These various platforms of data systems are aligned into formats that can be shared across multiple systems for ease of use by stakeholders.
- The Director of Schools wields broad powers to effect change processes that will positively affect personalized learning efforts.
- The overarching guidance tool is the district's Strategic Planning concept, from which individual schools and teachers develop their Action Plans of implementation.
- Collection, interpretation and communication of aggregate data is conveyed to a wide range of stakeholders.
- Data system specifically designed to deliver analysis of financial systems management (MUNIS), assists applicant with non-academic related data.
- This information is used in personalized student and teacher development plans.

The information presented by applicant addresses all components of these criteria, resulting in a high score.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	**15**	**15**

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

CMCSS demonstrates an early adoption and consistent tract record of continuous improvement processes. In 2002 applicant adopted their Strategic Planning Process and District to Schools Alignment with an emphasis on continuous improvement.

CMCSS shows a strong commitment to qualified programs that have broad acceptance in the quality improvement field.

CMCSS uses the Balanced Leadership approach to guide the focus on continuous improvement. LEA rely on their Strategic Planning to measure results, monitor progress and meet with stakeholders to determine effectiveness.

CMCSS also has a mid-year and end of the year review for assessment of the plan alignment.

CMCSS indicates monthly review of principals for progress adherence, with weekly Instructional Team meetings to review progress and allow for directional adjustments if required.

Funding activities, plant operations, teacher involvement, student progresses are collectively evaluated through the District's Strategic Planning Process and the ISO 9001:2008 - Quality Management.

Applicant has history of engaging in various quality products and systematically conveying results to public and stakeholders. This capacity will facilitate applicants ability to measure task feasibility versus documented effectiveness.

The documented continuous improvement process provided by the applicant warrants the highest score.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- CMCSS uses comprehensive list of tools to disseminate information and otherwise communicate with stakeholders.
- Web-based, phone calls, text messages, emails, and traditional face-to-face meetings are methods used to maintain ongoing communication and engage stakeholders.
- With video being a highly effective communication tool, CMCSS has a web video sit to drive this form of communication in delivering student activities.

Applicants use of web video, and an impressive collection of community meetings to provide access to stakeholders. This compliance and network of communication tools results in high score.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- CMCSS lists twelve performance measures that are trackable and measurable, given the applicants track record. However, insufficient, unclear documentation given for why these measures were selected.
- Charts and information contained therein refer to only chosen performance measures. This may be by design or omission.
- The performance measures are ambitious and generally achievable. I am less convinced item #10: 100% of parents/guardian engaged student learning through communication. The measuring tools are in place to gage efficacy of intention and goal.

The lack of clear correlation between charts provided and information given contribute to a mid-range score.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant demonstrates an early adoption and consistent tract record of continuous improvement processes.
- CMCSS shows a strong commitment to qualified programs that have broad acceptance in the quality improvement field.
- CMCSS uses a Balanced Leadership approach to guide the focus on continuous improvement.
- CMCSS also has a mid-year and end of the year review for assessment of plan alignment.
- CMCSS indicates monthly reviews of principals for progress adherence, with weekly Instructional Team meetings to review progress and allow for directional adjustments if required.
- Funding activities, plant operations, teacher involvement, student progresses are collectively evaluated through the Strategic Planning Process and the ISO 9001:2008 - Quality Management.

Use and application of funding received is clearly dedicated to qualities of learning reformation in their proposal, this results in the highest score as given.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	**10**	**7**

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- CMCSS provides detailed, comprehensive budget analysis of funding to implement their reform vision proposal.
- CMCSS depicted a clearly delineated roadmap of the source of funds to enact the details of the vision.
- Funding allocation is detailed and reasonable to adequately support the applicant's proposal, but is not clear for the one-time investments.
- Details are sufficiently specific to address common sense, rationale use of grant monies, resulting in a medium score.

	Available	Score
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	**10**	**8**

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Although a great proposal, some elements of a high quality plan were omitted. The applicant for the most part provided evidence to rely on Federal funding, United Way and home state economic recovery to support their proposal. Applicant did not list time-lines and responsible parties to support the project.

- CMCSS offers its Strategic Planning Process as the driving force to ensure sustainabilty of the proposal goals.
- This planning process is their all-encompassing guidance tool for vision implementation.
- CMCSS describes historical community funding and external funding opportunities to sustain vision operations.
- CMCSS offers local sustainability of their high-quality vision through capacity building among local school and district personnel to perform the work.
- CMCSS's reform vision is distilled into four project goals with detailed funding per area.
- Applicant has secured letters of support from government officials and departments attesting to the capabilities of the applicant to attain goals as stated in grant proposal.
- The list of the above-mentioned, along with the generated support from public and private business and government leaders is positive and this results in the score given.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	**10**	**5**

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

- CMCSS's narrative identified a broad spectrum of partners, however there was insufficient evidence of detailed relationships with partners as called for in the Competitive Preference Priority.
- Performance measure were listed as required, with ambitious goals for students at key outcome points.
- Not clearly evidenced in the reform process was the applicant's vision of working with existing partners or creating new partnerships to address the social-emotional, behavioral needs of immigrants/refugees.
- There was no mention of immigrants/refugees.

Applicant boasts a significant number of partners which would indicate financial and programmatic support. The score was negatively impacted by a lack of coherent commitment resulting in a mid-range medium score.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The collective review of the programs, initiatives as listed in various categories in the proposal, shows how CMCSS coherently and comprehensively addresses the grant requirements.

	Available	Score
Total	**210**	**157**

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	15

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

- Although some elements of a high quality plan were omitted, the applicant for the most part provided evidence to rely on Federal funding, United Way and home state recover to support the proposal.
- Applicant did not list timelines and responsible parties to support the project.
- CMCSS submitted a strong justification for technology maintenance and acquisition as an integral part of forming individualized learning plans and adjusting the personal needs of students and teachers.
- The use of emerging technology has clear, documented support in enhancing student learning gains.
- Applicant has foresight to seek funding to maintain technological relevancy and avoid somnolence of hardware/software for the New Tech Model, a school with-in a school.
- The applicants' proposal submitted a strong justification for technology maintenance and acquisition as an integral part of forming individualized learning plans, but does not include a high quality plan. The use of emergining technology has documented support in enhancing student-learning gains. The applicant has foresight to seek funding to maintain technology relevancy and avoid somnolence of hardware/software for the New Tech Model, which substantiates the high score. The extensive justification for technology is a vital part of the grant proposal, but a high quality plan was not present and the project did not appear to be developed as a separate plan from the main proposal.

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0328TN-3 for Clarksville Montgomery County School System

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	**10**	**7**

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of a comprehensive and coherent reform vision for the project's high schools.

- The New Tech High Model at the high schools will focus on personalization to meet student needs.
- The New Tech Model provides a data system to measure students growth as required in the four core assurances.

The applicant fails to provide sufficient evidence that one of the four core assurance areas (data systems) will be used for grades K-8 schools.

- The New Tech Model provides a data system but was only identified as being used at the high schools.
- The three Strategic Work Plans for 2010 - 2013 do not provide sufficient information on the development and growth of a data system for K-8.

Overall, the applicant provided evidence of a vision but failed to substantiate a comprehensive plan due to insufficient evidence provided for a K-8 data system as part of the four core assurances.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	**10**	**7**

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant will use High School Redesign and New Tech Model along with the Multi-Level Intervention Pyramid to combine as a strong reform model to support high-quality school-level implementation throught the implentation structures inherently included in the aforementioned systems.

(a) The applicant will serve all schools and students in the district but failed to provide evidence of the process used to select the schools to participate.

- No reasoning or process was described as to why the district chose to serve all schools and students.

(b)(c) The applicant provided a comprehensive list of the participating schools as well as the required student demographics.

- Information for indicators b and c were detailed in a chart provided by the DOE.

Overall, the applicant provided detailed information on all participating schools but failed to provide evidence of the process used to decide why all schools should be served. The High School Redesign, New Tech Model, and Multi-Level Intervention Pyramid will support high-quality LEA level and school level implementation.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	**10**	**3**

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides sufficient evidence of district-wide reform through a Strategic Planning Process but fails to address the elements of a high-quality plan including goals linked to activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

- The applicant is serving all district schools and students and is not required to address how the proposal will be scaled up.
- The steps to reach goals are *High School Redesign* using *New Tech (NTM) Academies Model, 3-Tier K-12 Reading and Math Intervention Pyramid Model,* and the *Teacher Selection and Professional Development Model.* All three of the steps include personalization of learning.
- Detailed plans, timelines, and responsibilities are not provided.

Overall, the applicant provided evidence of a vision and goals, but failed to provide enough evidence through a detailed plan, timelines and responsibilities to assure a high quality plan to reach the intended outcomes.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	**10**	**6**

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The applicant demonstrated sufficient evidence of improved student learning through use of the Tennessee Comprehensive Program for grades 3-8 and Eng. II and Alg. I but failed to provide summative or performance measures for grades K-2. Achieve for grades 3-8 math and reading and End of Course results for Algebra I and English II. The Modified Achievement Assessment for grades

- The applicant set an ambitious yet achievable goal that of 3% growth in each goal area. This is 1% higher than the percent of growth set by the state department of education. This will be achieved through the New Tech High Model and specialized reading and math programs.
- No information was provided on performance or summative assessments to be used for participating schools including grades K-2.

(b) The applicant provides evidence to support decreased achievement gaps between subgroups.

- Using the TN DOE formula for reducing achievement gaps, the applicant will decrease reduce gaps by 3% each academic year.
- The 3-Tier Intervention Pyramid will provide individualized learning plans to help reduce the achievement gap.

(c) The applicant set an ambitious goal of a 100% graduation rate but failed to provide a detailed plan of how the programs will be implemented with integrity.

- Grade and credit recovery are already in place. No details, timelines, or persons responsible were provided for implementing High School Redesign.
- Timelines were provided for the New Tech High Model but did not have assigned implementation responsibilities for school personnel.

(d) The applicant provides the formula to measure a 2% increase in student college enrollment per year of the project but failed to adequately link programs in this area to the outcomes.

- The addition of Virtual Programs, Credit and Grade Recovery, and individualized learning plans support students being prepared to enroll in college.
- There is a lack of information describing who the programs will be implemented and used by students in order to increase college enrollment.

Overall, the applicant has ambitious goals but fails to provide sufficient evidence of a comprehensive plan of implementation to assure improved student learning and increased equity.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	**15**	**8**

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates a record of success in the past four years by closing student achievement gaps, advancing student learning, and increasing graduation rates.

(a) Clarksville Montgomery County School District has, in the past, and currently works with ISO 9001 and AdvancED to continue a focus on continuous improvement. The district has increased the graduation rate from 74% in 2002 to 95.2% in 2012. Three years of data show math and reading for all grades has increased 7.3% and 3.4%, respectfully. Achievement gaps for ED, ELL, and minorities has decreased. College readiness as measured by ACT and PLAN increased from 10% in 2008 to 14% in 2012. Only three years of informatoin was provided for math and reading.

(b) The applicant indicated that they have no priority schools and two focus schools. No information was provided related to reforms specifically in the lower-performing schools. Therefore, there is little evidence to support the applicant's ability to achieve ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest achieving schools.

(c) The district has a transparency policy which includes posting information to a website, public forums, community meetings and the use of media. The applicant failed to describe how the information made available will be used to inform and improve instruction and services.

Overall, the applicant does have a record or success but failed to provide information on how they will work with their lowest achieving schools, how student performance data will be presented in ways to inform and improve participation, instruction, and services and did not have enough information on state test scores.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant fosters transparency in the budgeting process by utilizing the Performance Based Budgeting process but fails to provide the minimum information necessary to assure this transparency includes the four categories of school-level expenditures.

a. The applicant describes a "high-level view" and a "ground-level view" with no evidence of providing actual personnel salaries at the school level for all instructional and support staff.

b. There is no evidence of transparency in the budget (narrative or appendix) in regards to school level salaries for instructional personnel only.

c. There is no evidence of transparency in the budget (narrative or appendix) in regards to school level salaries for teachers only.

d. There is no evidence of transparency in the budget (narrative or appendix) in regards to school level non-personnel expenditures although the process closely links goals and objectives to financial performance.

Overall, the applicant failed to provide evidence that there is a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments in relation to school level expenditures. Also, descriptions and evidence provided related to only district level transparency without the minimum evidence required to assure the necessary transparancy which indicates a a score within the low range.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy to implement the personalized learning environments through several regulatory programs.

- The Board of Education utilizes Policy Governance which sets executive limits in order to monitor goals without interrupting the daily work of personnel.
- Tennessee Code 49-2-203 provides the local board the authority to manage and control all public schools under its jurisdiction.
- A Director of Schools (exclusive to Tennessee) is given the autonomy to design and implement programs such as Race to the Top District.
- A Senior Leadership Team and Continuous Improvement Committees meet throughout the year to monitor strategic plans.

Overall, the applicant provides evidence of systems in place to implement the personalized learning environments.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	4

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant fails to provide sufficient evidence of how stakeholders were involved in the development of the proposal or, if appropriate, how the proposal is revised based on their involvement and feedback.

a. The applicant provided evidence of a Strategic Planning Process which uses stakeholders to organize and direct the work of the district but failed to provided evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement and support.

- Communication groups consisting of major stakeholders are described as being involved in the process without providing details of how they impacted the development and will continue to be involved in the implementation of the project.
- Fish Bowl activities were noted as how stakeholders identified next steps without any description of the Fish Bowl activities.
- The applicant described several school partnerships such as 100% Graduation in Clarksville's Business Project, Partners in Education, and the Army Youth Programs in Your Neighborhood but failed to provide information on how they are engaged in the project.
- No information was provided as to how stakeholders feedback was used to revise the proposal as needed.

i - ii. The applicant failed to provide information on the direct engagement and support for the proposal from teachers.

- No information was provided as to whether the LEA is with or without collective bargaining representation.
- No information was provided as to whether teachers supported the proposal.

b. The applicant failed to provide letters of support from most key stakeholders.

- The only letters of support provided were from the mayors of Montgomery County and the City of Clarksdale.

Therefore, this section receives a low score due to the lack of sufficient evidence that there has been meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of and subsequently the implementation of this proposal.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	**5**	**2**

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant failed to provide evidence that the logic behind the reform proposal was based on identified needs and gaps.

- The proposal details student achievement baselines and goals based on summative test scores but fails to delineate areas of focus based on the scores.
- The proposal describes Strategic Plan Core Strategies and aligned outcomes without linking them to identified needs and gaps.
- The 100% Parent Project is included under this section without any evidence of baseline data or identified needs in this area.
- The applicant did not include a detailed plan, timeline, and responsibilities which they noted was to be in the appendix.
- The applicant proposes to provide personalized learning environments through the New Tech Model and the 3 Tier Intervention Model.

Overall, the applicant did not provide enough evidence to ensure a high-quality plan for an analysis of their current status including needs and gaps to be addressed.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	**20**	**10**

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a. The applicant provides insufficient evidence of a high-quality plan for improving learning through personalizing the learning environment due to a lack of timelines, deliverables, and persons responsible.

i- Insufficient evidence is provided that students will understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals.

ii- The 3 Tier Intervention Pyramid and High School Redesign will offer students the opportunity to set goals and build their personalized learning plans while building college and career readiness skills.

iii- The programs chosen offer opportunities to build on student interests which in turn deepens student learning.

iv- There is a lack of evidence to prove that the outlined programs and activities will expose students to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives to motivate and deepen student learning.

v- The programs outlined provide a rigorous curriculum with goal-setting, problem-solving, and working with others to reach goals.

b. The applicant provides evidence of a plan in place to ensure personalized learning plans and quality instructional approaches for all students.

i- 3-Tier Intervention Pyramid, High School Redesign, and New Tech Model provide the opportunity for personalized leaning goals and skill development to ensure the student graduates on time and college and career ready.

ii- High school academies, STEM strategies, READ 180, READ Well, LIPS, Carnegie Math, and Algebra Rescue are examples of some of the high quality instructional approaches.

iii- Direct instruction and virtual instructional opportunities are included in the project which are aligned with college and career readiness skills.

iv- Insufficient evidence is provided to ensure regular feedback to measure student progress toward mastery of college and career readiness or to make personalized learning recommendations based on the student's current knowledge.

v- The 3-Tier Intervention Pyramid provides accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students to ensure they are on track toward meeting college and career readiness skills.

c. The applicant did not provide evidence that students would be trained and support offered to assure students understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them.

Overall, there is not evidence of high-quality approaches to learning to meet the needs of all learners with insufficient evidence provided on how feedback will be used, how students will be trained and supported in the use of the new programs or key timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. This places the applicant's score in the low end of the medium range.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	**20**	**14**

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a. The applicant did not provide sufficient evidence of a high-quality plan for improving teaching and learning due to a lack of timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. Programs will be used to promote the personalized learning environments: the New Tech Model and 3-Tier Intervention Pyramid.

i - Teachers will be trained on the personalized learning components: High School Redesign, New Tech Model, and 3-Tier Intervention Pyramid.

ii- High School Redesign, New Tech Model, and 3-Tier Intervention Model provide opportunities to personalize the learning based on student needs and interests.

- The proposal will use blended instruction (with virtual instruction) to optimize learning approaches.
- The personalized approaches did not address common tasks or collaborative work.

iii- Data analysis will be ongoing throughout the year using a wide breadth of data to measure student progress. This includes TestDrive, PowerSchools, the state student information data management system, and the state test data system.

- The 3-Tier Intervention Pyramid provides individualized interventions as well as accelerated growth instruction for students.

iv. The Professional Development Activities Network is a professional development data management system that provides feedback on effectiveness, and provides support for and individualized professional development plan.

b. The applicant provides sufficient evidence that teachers will be trained on the tools and resources to accelerate student learning and increase their college and career readiness.

i- The New Tech Model and 3-Tier Intervention Pyramid use research based instructional resources to help teachers identify optimal learning approaches.

ii- Effective, research based instructional resources will be used (READ 180-44, Language!, Scholastic Reading and Math as well as a variety of assessment methods.

- No details were given on the tools to create and share new resources.

iii- The individualized learning models provide opportunities to improve feedback to meet student needs.

c. Sufficient evidence was provided on leadership training and resources to meet student needs.

i- The Professional Development focus provides Individual Learning Paths to direct learning to teacher needs and continuous improvement.

ii- The Professional Development Activities Network allows for continuous teacher improvement to increase student performance.

d. The applicant provided evidence that the Teacher Selection and Professional Development Model focuses on research based strategies for successful recruitment and retention of effective teachers to better serve students.

Overall, the applicant provided insufficient evidence of a high-quality plan to improve teaching and learning through individualized plans, failed to provide evidence of common or collaborative student work opportunities or what tools will be used to create and share new resources and did not provide timelines, deliverables, or responsible parties to constitute a high-quality plan.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	**15**	**11**

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided evidence that practices and policies are in place to facilitate personalized learning but failed to provide evidence of a high-quality plan with timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

a. The district has implemented The International Standards for Organizations 9001 and AdvanceED certification to ensure that their services consistently meet the needs of the students.

- The Strategic Planning Process ensures a continued focus on meeting the needs of the students and setting goals to provide appropriate support and services for students.

b. The district uses the concept of McRELs Distributed Leadership which creates collaboration and flexibility to assume responsibility for the growth of the LEA.

c. Administrators use Virtual School and Virtual Program (virtual and blended learning environments) along with other individualized programs to allow students to set their own pace in demonstrating mastery.

d. No evidence was provided that students would have the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways.

e. The 3-Tier Intervention Pyramid provides learning environments to meet the needs of all learners including English Language Learners and students with disabilities.

Overall, the applicant provided adequate evidence that they have practices in place to facilitate personalized learning but failed to describe the evidence for providing students opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple ways or provide components of a high quality plan such as timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	**10**	**7**

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a. The applicant failed to provide sufficient evidence of how all participants and stakeholders will have access to necessary content and resources both in and out of school.

b. The applicant failed to describe how participants and stakeholders will have appropriate technical support through a range of strategies.

c. The applicant provides evidence of a variety of technology systems to provide personal learning plans for students.

- No evidence was provided on how the information technology systems will allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format.

d. The applicant provides evidence of adequate systems in place to provide and track data on human resources data, student information data, budget data, and instructional data.

Overall, the applicant provides sufficient evidence of an infrastructure in place to provide support personalized learning but fails to describe how participants and stakeholders have the appropriate level of technical support or how parents and students will be able to export their information in an open data format and does not represent a high quality plan with a lack of timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. This places the applicant's score in the medium range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	**15**	**9**

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence through Quality, Fidelity, Intensity, and Consistency (QFIC - Balanced Leadership), Strategic Planning Model, Senior Leadership Teams, and Senior Instructional Teams to assure a focused approach to to identifying measures of success, next steps, and how to communicate with stakeholders but fails to provide evidence of a high quality program with timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties

- No description was provided of how the applicant will publicly share information on the results of the project.

Overall, the applicant has in place a strategy to ensure continuous improvement but fails to provide sufficient information on how information about the project will be shared wit the public a the elements of a high-quality plan including timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. This places the applicant's score in the medium range.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	**5**	**3**

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of ongoing communication and engagement through the Strategic Planning Process, Senior Leadership Teams and Professional Learning Communities but lacks the components of a high quality plan with timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

- Monthly stakeholder meetings provide the community the opportunity to monitor implementation.
- Leadership and instructional teams meet weekly to identify project status.
- There is a lack of details in how much external stakeholders will be engaged in the continuous improvement plan.

The applicant provides evidence of ongoing communication with internal and external stakeholders but fails to provide evidence meaningful engagement for the external stakeholders or the elements of a high-quality plan including timelines, deliverables, or responsible parties. This places the applicant's score in the medium range.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	**5**	**2**

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides sufficient evidence of review of measurements over time for improvement but fails to provide the selection process or how the measures are related to the theory of action for the proposal nor the elements of a high quality plan such as timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

- The proposal has 12 performance measures by subgroup with annual targets.
- No rationale was given for selection of the measures.
- No description was given of how the measure will provide pertinent information related to the proposed plan.
- The Strategic Planning Process and various teams will be used to review and improve the measures as needed to gauge the implementation process

Overall, the applicant has adequate performance measures and a system for reviewing the measures to gauge the implementation progress but fails to provide a rationale for the selection process, how the measures will provide pertinent information related to the proposed plan or the elements of a high quality plan; timelines, deliverables, or responsibilities. This places the applican'ts score in the medium range.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	**5**	**3**

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of an evaluation process to determine the effectiveness of the project investments but fails to have a high-quality plan due to the lack of timelines and responsible parties..

- The logic model details how funded activities will be evaluated for effectiveness.
- The Strategic Plan details how use of staff and funds will be evaluated for effectiveness.

Overall, the applicant provided evidence of an a sufficient evaluation process through a logic model and Strategic Planning process but lacks evidence of a high-quality plan with timelines and responsible parties. This places the applicant's score in the medium range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	**10**	**6**

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a budget, including a budget narrative and evidence that the budget is reasonable for the implementation of the proposal.

- A budget was provided broken down by major categories with a narrative to describe each budget category.
- The general district budget was provided without providing how funds other than the grant will support the proposal.
- The budget is reasonable to support the implementation of the proposal.
- One time use investments and ongoing operational costs were not delineated or identified.
- No rationale was provided for the allocation of funds

Overall, the applicant provided a reasonable budget with narrative but failed to identify or describe other funds used to support the proposal or the rationale behind the budget.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	**10**	**3**

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides inadequate evidence of a high quality plan of sustainability.

- Support from the State government leaders was not included.
- Part of the sustainability relies on a yearly growth in student enrollment which provides a per pupil funding base for basic services and not supplemental funds for grant sustainability.
- The district will pursue outside grants and some funds will be provided from the local educational foundation.

Overall, the applicant provides inadequate evidence of a quality plan of sustainability and lacks clarity of state and local financial support.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	**10**	**5**

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence they have an established partnership with local businesses and community agencies but lacks clarity in how well the partnership will provide support and resource alignment.

1. More than 100 community and business organizations have signed a commitment to partner with the district for 100% Graduation is Clarksvilles Business.

- The collaboration with business leaders began in 2008.
- The proposal does not adequately describe other education outcome results.

2. Twelve desired results are aligned to the Race to the Top District proposal and identify educational and other education outcomes. At least seven of the desired results are population-level to meet the needs of a specific group.

3. a. A system is in place to track the educational measures at an aggregate level.

- No information is provided on how measures will be tracked at the student level.
- No information is given on how the other education outcomes, such as use of technology, will be tracked.

b. No description is given as to how data will be used to target resources to improve student achievement.

- Information was not provided as to how the data will target resources toward students with significant challenges.

c. The district is serving all students so there is no need to describe a strategy to scale the model.

d. The partnership has been in existence since 2008 and has proven results with an increased graduation rate. The proposal will continue the partnership with

a focus on results for the identified goals.

4. The applicant gives general information about how the partnership causes the school and community to be meaningfully engaged but fails to describe how the will integrate education and other services.

5. The applicant fails to describe how they partnership will build capacity of the staff.

a. Information is provided as to how the proposal will assess the needs and assets of students through personalized learning.

- There is no description of how the proposal assessments are aligned with family and community partnership goals.

b. No description is provided of how the project will identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community that are aligned to the project goals.

c. The Strategic Planning Process will provide the infrastructure to implement and evaluate supports for students' individualized needs.

d. The parents will be involved through the 100% Parent component.

- There is no detailed description of how families will be engaged in the decision-making process to improve results.

e. The proposal lacked a plan to have the partnership routinely assess the applicant's progress and maximize effectiveness.

6. The applicant has identified annual performance measures that are ambitious and achievable.

- Population-level desired results are detailed in charts.

Overall, the applicant provides evidence on a strong existing partnership but fails to provide pertinent information as to how the partnership will support and maximize the effectiveness of the Race to the Top District proposal.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	**Met/Not Met**	**Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of learning environments to improve learning and teaching through High School Redesign, New Tech Model, 3 Tier Intervention Pyramid, and the Teacher Individual Learning Paths. Tennessee and the district have adopted the standards for college and career readiness and outcomes are aligned to these standards. The personalized learning structures will allow students to work at their own pace and accelerate learning. The Teacher Selection and Professional Development Model will increase student access to effective teachers. Student gaps will be decrease through the 3 Tier Intervention Pyramid as well as 100% Parent component. The overall focus of the proposal is for students who are college and career ready and 100% graduation rate.

Total	210	122

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	3

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The applicant failed to provide clear evidence that the optional budget is a discrete and innovative solution to meet Absolute Priority 1.

1. No rationale is provided for the selection of the middle school and high school population for the optional budget.

- The technology will be used to enhance personalized learning with no indication of its' use for hard to measure skills or traits or other areas identified in the criteria.

2. The optional budget funds will be implemented across more than two schools to provide one-to-one computers for 12th grade students and more robust laptop computers for 219 middle school teachers.

- The optional budget plan does not detail a high-quality plan of how the activities will be implemented and carried out.

3. A budget is provided which is reasonable in relation to cost per computer.

- There is a lack of evidence as to how the computers for seniors and middle schools teachers will significantly impact the goals of the proposal.

Due to the lack evidence of a high-quality plan for the optional budget, the applicant scores in the low range for this criteria.